

REMARKS

The Official Action dated 29 March 2004 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodden.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodden.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodden in view of Real et al.

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 5-7 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 9 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1. Claim 8 to which claim 9 is dependent thereon has also been deleted and has also been included into claim 1.

Claim 2 is dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 2.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 3.

Claim 5 which is indicated to be allowable has been written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 6 is dependent on the amended claim 5.


Claim 7 is dependent on claim 6.

Claim 10 which have been rejected in view of the art have been cancelled, so that it is unnecessary to discuss the grounds of rejection specific thereto.

Accordingly, claims 1-7 would appear to be allowable, and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner CROW are appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
CHARLES E. BAXLEY
Attorney of Record
USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor
New York, N.Y. 10038
TEL: (212) 791-7200
FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.